

April 30, 1975

of transacting business, I propose to sign and do sign LB 316. Under the same circumstances, I propose to sign and do sign LB 466.

CLERK: Now, Mr. President, LB 430. Mr. President, the E & R amendments had earlier been adopted and the bill was advanced to E & R for engrossing. There is now a motion to return LB 430 to Select File for specific amendment. Signed Senator Goodrich. The specific amendment is to strike the Barnett amendment.

PRESIDENT: The question is, the adoption of the Goodrich amendment. Senator Lewis.

SENATOR F. LEWIS: I want to talk to the Goodrich amendment.

PRESIDENT: Well, Senator Goodrich returned to the Chambers so I think it would be appropriate to recognize him first. OK. I appreciate that, Senator Lewis.

SENATOR GOODRICH: Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Goodrich.

SENATOR GOODRICH: Mr. President and members of the body, this particular amendment is an amendment...has the bill been returned yet? Oh, first we have to return the bill, right? Vince.

PRESIDENT: So we can clarify, it usually happens that on the motion to return, Senators discuss the specific amendment so we will attempt to eliminate the duplication of debate.

SENATOR GOODRICH: OK. Then, the actual motion is to return the bill for specific amendment, the amendment being, to strike the Barnett amendment. The Barnett amendment, on this particular bill, was the bill...was the amendment, rather, that said that cities that levy the 1% must give a \$6 refund to all the citizens that they collect the tax from, and what we are doing is striking that requirement from the bill so that, for example, the city of Omaha would lose \$2.2 million from this particular amendment alone plus the fact that they would lose about \$400,000 worth of revenue sharing money because if revenue sharing ever does get started again, which we anticipate fairly shortly, the revenue sharing is based on the local tax effort, and since that local tax effort would be reduced by this, the cities that have to pay this back, Lincoln and Omaha and Bellevue, would also lose revenue sharing money besides losing the refund money. So technically, the amount of loss to the city of Omaha would be 2.6 million dollars per year. In Lincoln, it would be about 1.2 million dollars per year and Bellevue would be proportionately less, but whatever proportion they are paying in. The thing is that the city of Omaha, for example, is within 1 1/2 mills of their limit right now, mill levy limit, and they cannot make up 2.6 million with this 1 1/2. One mill equals a million dollars in Omaha. Consequently, a million and a half is the most they could raise by going to the maximum mill levy and, consequently, they would lose a